

REMARKS

Claims 1-10 are now pending in the application. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejection(s) in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 1 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. In addition, Claim 1 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. This rejection is respectfully traversed. Although applicants disagree with these rejections, the claim limitation of concern has been removed from the pending claims, thereby rendering the rejections moot. Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,872,771 (Park) in view of an article authored by Liebeherr et al. entitled "Effective Envelopes: Statistical Bounds on Multiplexed Traffic in Packet Networks (Liebeherr). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Park is directed generally to an adaptive connection admission control technique. However, as noted by the Examiner, Park fails to disclose an admission control condition based on a first envelope associated with incoming traffic, a second envelope

associated with admitted traffic and a service curve associated with departing traffic. More specifically, this reference is deficient in two respects.

First, Park employs scalar values, such as cell loss rate, for admission control. Thus, Park fails to teach or suggest the use of envelopes as recited in Applicant's claimed invention. Second, Park does not teach or suggest an admission condition where the arriving traffic is sum with the admitted traffic and then compared to the departing traffic. Given these deficiencies, the teachings of Park do not appear to improve upon or supplement the teachings of Liebeherr. At a minimum, these deficiencies call into question the motivation or rationale for combining the teachings Park with Liebeherr.

On the other hand, Liebeherr is directed generally to a statistical service that makes probabilistic service guarantees. However, as noted in the last sentence of this article, "the admission control methodology presented in this paper needs to be extended to a network environment". Of note, the authors had not contemplated how this work could be applied to multiple service classes. Accordingly, this reference fails to teach or suggest an admission control technique for servicing traffic with multiple service classes.

In contrast, Applicant's invention is directed to an admission control technique which guarantees that QoS requirements of one service class using an ingress-to-egress path will be satisfied if a new set of flows for another service class are admitted into the domain. Claim 1 has been amended to further define this aspect of the present invention. In particular, Claim 1 recites "testing an admission control condition for each of the service classes ..." and "admitting said arriving traffic when the admission control

condition is satisfied for each of the service classes" in combination with other elements of this claim. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that Claim 1, along with claims depending therefrom, defines patentable subject matter over this combination of references. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection.

CONCLUSION


It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: May 25, 2006

By:



Timothy D. MacIntyre
Reg. No. 42824

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

TDM/drl